

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

BY

IRVING FISHER

PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS IN
YALE UNIVERSITY



FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY
NEW YORK AND LONDON

PRICES: Per copy 60 cents; ten copies, \$5.00; one hundred copies, \$30.00; one thousand copies, \$240.00. Cloth edition, per copy, \$1.00.



AMERICA'S INTEREST IN
WORLD PEACE

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

BY

IRVING FISHER

PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS IN
YALE UNIVERSITY



REDWOOD LIBRARY
NEWPORT, R. I.

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY
NEW YORK AND LONDON

161925C

COPYRIGHT, 1924, BY
FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY
[Printed in the United States of America]
Published, September, 1924.

F^oH

F53

Copyright Under the Articles of the Copyright Convention
of the Pan-American Republics and the
United States, August 11, 1910.

TO THE MEMORY
OF
THEODORE ROOSEVELT
AND
WOODROW WILSON



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

PREFACE

This little book is a very brief résumé of my "League or War?" with some additional data to bring it down to date. Like the larger book, it aims at convincing all readers, who are willing to be convinced, that America is making a grievous mistake in so long delaying her inevitable entrance into the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague and the League of Nations at Geneva.

What has been delaying our doing these two things, which most other countries have done, is the unscrupulous propaganda of a small band of irreconcilables. One of the most unscrupulous parts of this propaganda was the circulation, after Theodore Roosevelt's death, of the untruth that he was opposed to the League. For this reason I have dedicated this book to his memory, as well as to the memory of Woodrow Wilson. Roosevelt was the first great statesman to pro-

PREFACE

pose what he called "a league of nations for the peace of righteousness." He stood unswervingly for that principle to the end of his life. Here was one subject at least on which Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson agreed.

IRVING FISHER.

Yale University, *August*, 1924.

As this book goes to press the wonderful news comes that Germany has decided to apply for membership in the League of Nations. From having once thought that the League might be used to enforce the Treaty of Versailles against her, she has come to see that the League is the one hope of tempering that treaty. This action of Germany, following the actual resuscitation of Austria through the League, should remove the opposition to the League in America from German-Americans, just as the dramatic action of Ireland in joining the League last year caused the opposition of Irish-Americans to collapse. Those senators now stand still more discredited who, misrepresenting the League, are "blasting the hopes" of Ireland and Germany.

I. F.

September 24, 1924.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	vii
CHAPTER	
I. AMERICA'S IMPOSSIBLE SITUATION	13
Introduction—The Pro-League Trend— Political Platforms—Visiting the League —Truth Discredits Falsifiers—What Be- came of Slavery—America Stands Alone —Why We Stand Alone—Politics and the League—Partisan or Non-Partisan —Controlled by a Small Clique—This Clique Not Representative.	
II. ONLY ONE WAY OUT	31
The Public Confused—The Bok Prize— A Court Necessary—A Forum Too—Only One Court Available—And Only One Forum—Sitting In—The Isolationists Isolated.	
III. WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS	51
Introduction—The League Stopped Six Wars—Jugoslavia and Albania—The Corfu Incident—The League's Five Methods—The League Made the Court Possible—The League Rescued Austria —Why Not Germany Too? — The League's Humanitarian Work — The League Record as a Whole—What the Court Has Done.	

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV. OTHER SELFISH REASONS	77
Our Own Traditions—Theodore Roosevelt—William H. Taft—Woodrow Wilson—Warren G. Harding—Calvin Coolidge—Isolation Out of Date—Our Voice in the World—Our Stake in Europe's Trade and Debts—Our Interest in Competitive Armaments—Our Interest in World Peace—Conclusions.	
V. DO REAL OBJECTIONS EXIST? . .	101
The League Confused with the Treaty of Versailles—Would the League Take Our Soldiers Abroad?—The Monroe Doctrine—The Six British Votes—The Real Opposition.	
VI. OUR NATIONAL DUTY	115
In the Name of Humanity—America Needed—Our National Pride—What We Fought For—The Supreme Sacrifice.	

AMERICA'S IMPOSSIBLE SITUATION

I

AMERICA'S IMPOSSIBLE SITUATION

Introduction

This book treats of the most important subject before the world to-day, and incomparably the most important for America—all the more because America has not yet fully realized the fact.

How does it happen that American indifference is now diminishing? For everywhere evidence is accumulating that the American people are growing more and more restive over the inaction of their government.

The Pro-League Trend

I was recently informed by a gentleman from Glen Ridge, New Jersey, that his town had, as he expressed it, "changed its mind." Two years ago it had been almost unanimously against the

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

League of Nations; yet now, he said, it had become almost unanimously in favor of it. The change was due to discussion in the Open Forum of the town.

Writing recently in *The Atlantic Monthly*, H. H. Powers, the economist, who in 1920 was one of the most powerful opponents of the League, and who supplied much of the ammunition for the newspaper attacks on it, announced his own reversal of attitude, and stated that no doubt millions of other Americans had changed in the same way. Almost daily I meet people who, like Mr. Powers, have changed their minds and, like him, have the courage to confess it before the public.

The public is also willing and eager to learn. Test votes in audiences of many kinds, often "ready-made" audiences such as Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs and Labor Unions, invariably show, after the facts have been presented, over 90 per cent. in favor of our joining the League with this one interpretative reservation (to quiet the fears which have been aroused) that America must be the sole judge, in every concrete case,

AMERICA'S IMPOSSIBLE SITUATION

of what her moral responsibilities are under the League Covenant.

The strong resolutions for the League passed by a vote of about six thousand out of the seven thousand nine hundred students at the Indianapolis Students' Convention, and supposedly representing the views of a million others, opened many people's eyes, as did the strong resolution passed by the National Young Women's Christian Association, and the many resolutions of clergymen's conventions, to say nothing of the continued and consistent espousal of the League by the American Federation of Labor.

Political Platforms

The results are showing themselves in politics. The Republican platform of 1924 declares for entering the World Court—a child of the League—tho against our entering the League itself. Furthermore, the platform proposes that we “continue to cooperate with other nations in humanitarian efforts, in accordance with our cherished traditions. * * * ,” and adds: “The work of our representatives in dealing with sub-

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

jects of such universal concern as the traffic in women and children, the production and distribution of narcotic drugs, the sale of arms, and in matters affecting public health and morals, demonstrated that we can effectively do our part for humanity and civilization without forfeiting, limiting, or restricting our national freedom of action." Altho the fact is not mentioned, all of this cooperation is, and must continue to be, carried on *through the League of Nations!* The plank which the League of Nations Non-Partizan Association favored stated that we should "continue to cooperate with *the League of Nations* in humanitarian efforts." What got in, as above indicated, was that we should "continue to cooperate with *other nations* in humanitarian efforts." The framers of the platform were, of course, aware of the fact that only through the League can we so "continue." In fact, Coolidge in his acceptance speech boldly says that these forms of cooperation are with the *League*. In other words, we are already a back-door member of the League, and the Republican party proposes that we "continue" to be such.

AMERICA'S IMPOSSIBLE SITUATION

The Democratic party goes still further and is more explicit: "The Democratic party renews its declaration of confidence in the ideals of world peace, the League of Nations, and the World Court of Justice. * * * There is no substitute for the League of Nations. * * *" The platform then proposes a referendum, after the coming election, on the question whether America shall join the League. This referendum is intended to rescue the subject from partizan politics, and put it before the whole people. It is hoped that, in such a referendum, Republicans will feel as free as Democrats to vote for entering the League.

So it is clear that the matter is *not* settled. And why has it not been settled? Because great questions in history are not usually settled until settled right. Wrong and falsehood are pretty sure to be exposed in the end. Despite the fact that a few irreconcilables can seem to "fool all of the people some of the time" and "some of the people all of the time," they can not "fool all of the people all of the time."

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

Visiting the League

Not as long as some of the people can visit Geneva! What has changed Mr. Powers' view is what changes the views of the hundreds or thousands of Americans who visit the League at Geneva every summer, and then go home and tell their friends of the contrast between the actual League and the caricatures of it fabricated by politicians in 1920.

I was recently told of a party of twenty-five tourists, business and professional men, who made such a visit to Europe. On the steamer to Europe a poll showed that twenty-three of the twenty-five were, or thought they were, opposed to America's entering the League. On the return voyage, after visiting Geneva, the vote was unanimous the other way!

As I write, I find a report from Darling, the famous cartoonist of the *Des Moines Register*. Just returned from Geneva, he said on good authority, "Every anti-League newspaper which has sent a special correspondent to dig up faults of the League has either recalled its man or had

AMERICA'S IMPOSSIBLE SITUATION

the policy of the paper changed by his reports within two months."

Truth Discredits Falsifiers

Thus the contrast between the real League and the false portrayal of it in 1919-20 is ever obtruding itself in millions of minds.

No wonder that the *New York Times* says that the "Stars in their courses" fight for the League. No wonder that the suspicion is daily deepening that certain propagandists in 1920 put something over on the American people. Every one of their alleged arguments against the League has been belied by events. So they are now trying to prevent the truth from coming out by keeping silent, refusing to debate it, and asking their organs of publicity to keep silent and refuse to report pro-League meetings and speeches. When forced to refer to the subject at all, they take refuge in the false statement that the issue is dead. As the people, slowly but surely, are finding out how they were deceived by the little band of irreconcilables, they are learning to discredit these men. Witness the political reverses

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

or checks that have befallen Lodge, Johnson, Reed, McCormick, Moses, Shields—half of the group—in all cases largely and admittedly because of their stand on the League. The others have also lost caste. They had been running behind their tickets because of their opposition to the League, or “hedging,” by supporting the Hughes Disarmament Conference and proposing vaguely to “outlaw war.”

What Became of Slavery?

A similar situation was found in this country before the Civil War, when the Missouri Compromise, the Dred Scott decision, and the election of Buchanan, were supposed to have “solved” the question of slavery, and wiseacres in politics gravely informed us that the question of slavery was “settled.” Even Presidents of the United States tried to make the people think the Slavery question was a closed incident. But Slavery could not be settled until it was settled right.

America Stands Alone

Why is it that the League question has not been settled by America as the other countries

AMERICA'S IMPOSSIBLE SITUATION

have settled it? Why has America taken a different attitude from that of other countries? For to-day we find ourselves practically alone in the world on this subject. Practically the rest of the civilized world has joined both the World Court and the League of Nations. Forty-seven nations have joined the Court in the three years of its existence; fifty-four nations have joined the League in the five years of its existence. Both Court and League now include four-fifths of the population of this world—over a billion people! Besides America only unimportant nations, or nations not yet fully eligible for membership, remain outside. To be specific: Afghanistan, The Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Germany, Hedjaz, Iceland, Mexico, Russia, Tibet, Turkey; these stand with us. Is Uncle Sam to be known by the company he keeps?

Why We Stand Alone

Why do we thus stand alone? Is it because we alone have studied this subject thoroughly and dispassionately and reached an adverse opinion by solid reasoning, while the fifty-four

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

other nations have made an egregious blunder? Or is it because it is they who have considered the matter more fully, and with less bias, than we?

The answer is clear. Ninety-nine per cent. of our people have not even read the League Covenant. They have taken their ideas second-hand from certain other people, many of them doubtless sincere, while these, in turn, have taken theirs second-hand from still others, until, tracing it all back, we find the caricatures of the League emanating from a dozen men in Washington. It was these men, few in number, but great in influence, whose propaganda "put something over" on the American people.

Politics and the League

The real explanation of the riddle—the real reason why America has come to a different conclusion from nearly all the rest of the world (or rather has come to no clear conclusion at all) is that politics entered into the question in America as it did not enter elsewhere. In Switzerland the subject was considered apart from

AMERICA'S IMPOSSIBLE SITUATION

politics, in a popular referendum. In America, in the election of 1920, it was mixed up with every kind of political consideration. Indeed, the issue was never squarely drawn between our two great political parties. Many voters—perhaps millions—following Taft, Root, Hughes, Hoover, Strauss, Wickersham, Lowell, and the other distinguished “31,” actually thought that, by voting the Republican ticket, they were taking the shortest path into the League with proper reservations.

It is easy to see why dissension and confusion entered. Under the American system, treaties can not be made without the advice and consent of the Senate; and there is always a conflict between the President and the Senate over a treaty. The more important the treaty the more severe the conflict. It becomes still more severe when the Senate and the White House are of opposite political faith, and still more so when a political campaign is impending, and still more so when practically every member of the Committee on Foreign Relations is himself personally ambitious to be the next President of the

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

United States! Under such circumstances, it clearly was inevitable that these men should think in political terms—"How is this going to affect me, my future, and my party?"

Partizan or Non-Partizan

It is not necessary, however, to rearouse the hard feelings permeating the debates of 1919 and 1920. Both parties are now specifically pledged to joining the Court; both recognize the necessity of utilizing the League machinery, one openly and fully, the other covertly and partially, and one of the two proposes, if elected, to take out the partizanship still remaining through a popular referendum in which people of all varieties of politics may express their individual convictions apart from any other question whatsoever.

Thus, while there remains a real difference between the two great parties, that difference is far less than it promised to be. What is especially gratifying to those of us who have tried so hard to get and keep the subject out of politics is the practical certainty that whichever party wins in the coming election we shall *ulti-*

AMERICA'S IMPOSSIBLE SITUATION

mately and inevitably join Court and League alike. The Hughes plan for joining the Court requires our sitting in with the League temporarily, for the sole purpose of electing judges to the Court. The next step then plainly before us will be to sit in *permanently*, without a vote (except for Judges); and the next, to obtain the full vote as a privilege. These three steps may take many years without a referendum as against, perhaps, one year if a referendum is held. But success is in sight either way. Let us pray that a world war does not overtake us first!

Controlled by a Small Clique

The fact can not be overlooked, of course, that the Republican party has hitherto been controlled in this matter by the irreconcilables. Its pledge in 1920 of an "Association of Nations" has not only remained unredeemed, but has been abandoned in the 1924 platform. The party has failed, so far, to be guided by the repeated recommendations of Hughes, Harding, and Coolidge to secure membership for the United States in the World Court, altho over a year has inter-

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

vened since that proposal was first made. Likewise there are irreconcilable Democrats and half-hearted Democrats and disloyal Democrats.

The obstacle in both cases has been the irreconcilables, two Democrats, one Independent, and the rest Republicans, who, while few in numbers, dominate the Committee on Foreign Relations. They have indulged in every effort to delay and evade. They have offered impossible substitutes—not only the “Association of Nations,” but the bizarre Court plans of Lenroot, Lodge, and Pepper. These impracticable plans seemed devised to sidetrack the practicable plan of Hughes, Harding, and Coolidge. But they have all been repudiated by Mr. Coolidge and the Republican platform; so that now, at last, the irreconcilables can no longer claim to represent a party or the people.

This Clique Not Representative

Outside of these groups the Republican party still keeps a better standard. In 1918-20 many Republican leaders refused to play politics beyond the water's edge. My friend and former

AMERICA'S IMPOSSIBLE SITUATION

colleague at Yale, Chief Justice William Howard Taft, more than once stood up on the same platform with Woodrow Wilson and advocated the entry of the United States into the League of Nations. Even in the Senate, in spite of everything, the final vote by 57 to 39 was that we should enter the League of Nations, with some reservations. That is an important fact which some have almost forgotten. They remember only that we did not go in. The majority was greater than is usually obtained for an ordinary bill, tho falling short of the *two-thirds majority* required by the Constitution for ratifying a treaty. The cause of the League lacked just seven votes. Had there been just *seven more* men in the Senate as magnanimous, public-spirited, and patriotic as Mr. Taft and Mr. Hughes and Mr. Hoover, America would have been in the League of Nations to-day; war would be outlawed; universal disarmament would be no longer only a dream; and reparations and debts and balanced budgets and currency stability and gigantic standing armies would be problems solved or on the way to solution.

ONLY ONE WAY OUT

II

ONLY ONE WAY OUT

The Public Confused

The worst result of politics entering into the question has been to confuse the public mind. Instead of having a correct and accurate picture of the League, we have had many different pictures—some grotesque caricatures.

And with these many different pictures came many different alternative projects for maintaining peace. Some people want us to enter the League as the other nations have entered—without reservations; others propound reservations of one kind or another; others say: Drop the League and create a brand new "Association of Nations"; others suggest that we join the World Court only; others that we create a new world court. Just so long as we continue to dissipate our energies in these contrary directions,

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

just so long shall we continue to talk instead of to act.

The Bok Prize

Seeing this confusion, one of our fellow citizens, Mr. Edward Bok, with great public spirit, challenged the ingenuity of America to find the way out—not a newfangled plan to make confusion worse confounded, but a practical plan on which we could all agree. He offered the prize of \$100,000 to the person who could show the path to peace.

Over twenty-two thousand people answered this challenge by submitting plans; from among these plans the winning one was selected by a Committee of Award consisting of high-minded, public-spirited men and women, headed by Elihu Root.

The judges did not know the name of the winner until after their choice was made. When they looked in the envelope containing his name, it proved to be that of Charles H. Levermore, the man who, for four years past, has written the Year Book of the League of Nations. It can

ONLY ONE WAY OUT

scarcely be a coincidence that the best plan was that of the best posted man, the man who perhaps knows the most on this subject among living men in America.

And yet his plan is not complicated. Like most great plans, and most practical plans, it is very simple. Boiled down, it amounts merely to these two proposals: first, that America should join the World Court on the basis outlined by Secretary Hughes, advocated by Presidents Harding and Coolidge, and now endorsed by the Republican platform; secondly, as to the League of Nations, that, without joining as other nations have, we be present at its sessions and use it as a forum for discussion without a voter's responsibility. In this way we can try it out, and later, on the basis of experience, decide whether or not we want to follow the example of other nations and become a formal member of the League. This Bok plan (or Levermore plan) has been approved by 88 per cent. of the half million who have voted on it. Thus far has confusion yielded to common accord, so sorely needed in this important matter.

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

A Court Necessary

I believe that almost any of us, if we could forget what we have heard and devote an hour's thought to the subject, would come substantially to this very conclusion; that, if America is to do anything in cooperation with other nations, she must at least do two things—join them in a Court and sit in with them in a Forum. To join in a Court and sit in at a Forum is to reduce our cooperation to its lowest terms. We may do much more, but we can not do less and do anything worth while.

The institution called a Court is the supreme invention of civilization—the only device which works to prevent war when quarrels become acute. Without it, civilization could not exist. It has made peace possible in ever widening circles. When people talk loosely about the impossibility of abolishing war, they overlook the fact that we already have abolished war. We have abolished war wherever we have applied the remedy, courts. We have abolished war between indi-

ONLY ONE WAY OUT

viduals and between families, between cities, between states. All this is the work of the courts. Courts have proved that man is not by nature a fighting animal. In general he fights only when there is no alternative—no court readily available. When a dispute becomes acute, the two disputants must either fight it out, in which case the stronger wins, or else refer it to a third party, in which case justice has a chance. That is the idea of a Court, to substitute for interested force the decision of a disinterested third party, thereby giving justice a chance.

We see, then, that this great principle of courts, has displaced war as an institution in every field in which it has been applied, that is, in every field except the international field. Private war, or duelism, is practically extinct; as is blood revenge to settle family feuds. The Justice of the Peace has taken their place. So, also, eighty-seven disputes between our States have been settled by our Supreme Court, without which probably our States would more than once have been involved in war.

Once they did get into such a war. For no

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

court works 100 per cent. efficiently; no human being or institution does. But our Supreme Court certainly works excellently well in settling disputes between our States, while between individuals and between states, courts have reduced warfare by a large percentage in frequency, and by another large percentage in intensity also. Practically, then, courts abolish war.

The history of civilization thus consists principally in the replacement of war by law. History is largely the story of the enlargement of the peace group—from the family, which was the first peace group, to the town, or community, which was the next peace group, to the state, and to the nation—and each step has been made possible by courts. It only remains to apply this great principle between nations, just as it has been applied between states and smaller groups, in order to abolish war as an institution wholly and forever. For that purpose a World Court is indispensable.

And now at last we have such a Court, with 47 adherents, lacking only the United States to give it its full measure of prestige.

ONLY ONE WAY OUT

A Forum Too

Likewise, as to an International Forum, we may agree that, if America is to do anything toward maintaining world peace, it must be in constant conference with other nations. Even in private life most of our disputes are settled out of court. A court is merely the last resort. Long before disputes become so acute as to require going to law, we can usually settle them out of court, merely by talking them over and ironing out the misunderstandings on which they are usually founded. For this purpose the nations need a meeting place such as the League. Such a discussion place is useful in many other ways than merely to help settle disputes. The Council and Assembly of the League are (very roughly) analogous to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, while the World Court is analogous to the Supreme Court of the United States. It would be almost as absurd to try to get along with the World Court only and without the Council and Assembly of the League as it would be for us to try to get

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

along without Congress and with the Supreme Court as our only federal agency.

So I believe we may all agree that America ought not only to be in a Court with the rest of the world, but also to be in a Forum with the rest of the world, exactly as the Bok Peace Plan proposes. Thus we reach our first conclusion, that the least America can do is to join in a court and a forum.

But some objectors may say, "I admit we need *a* court and *a* forum, but why should these be *the* court at the Hague and *the* forum at Geneva, the League of Nations? Is it not possible to get a different court from this Court and a different forum from this League of Nations?"

First, we may make the Yankee reply, by asking a question in return: "Why should we?" I have yet to see any satisfactory answer to that question.

Only One Court Available

But a second answer is that we can *not*, as a matter of cold fact, get any substitute! It is impossible now for us to obtain a court in common

ONLY ONE WAY OUT

with the rest of the world unless it be that Court which the rest of the world already has in common! It is likewise impossible to obtain a forum in common with the rest of the world unless it be that Forum which the rest of the world already has in common! In 1919, when all plans were plastic, we might have succeeded in getting something else, but now in 1924, when the Court and the League are fully "set" and crystallized, it is impossible as well as unnecessary.

Think of the situation! Here we have a fully organized Court of eleven judges, with 47 nations as adherents which have accepted its court statute, with judges whose salaries are duly arranged for, with nine decisions behind them in their three years of experience, and with a big docket of business on hand and gradually building, out of a chaotic mass of individual opinions and expressions, a real body of International Law. Is all this machinery to be stopped and scrapped and its advantages thrown away because a handful of irreconcilables in America think—or pretend to think—that something else would be more to their taste?

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

But, some may ask, why not use "the old Hague Tribunal" instead? Now, the old Hague Tribunal is not, and never was, a court. It is simply a list of names on paper—a "*panel*" of 135 judges, not sitting as a court either at the Hague or anywhere else, not possessing any court organization, scattered all over the face of the earth, practising law, or sitting in their own local courts. Any of these men simply stand ready, if called upon by two disputing nations, to act as arbitrators. Very seldom have they been so called upon—less often than once a year for twenty years—because they are not an ever-ready, organized court, and it requires a good deal of trouble to select, and draft for action, any one judge among them, to serve merely as a temporary arbitrator.

The truth is, there never has been any court among nations other than the new International Court of Justice, now three years old. It alone really sits at the Hague, in the Peace Palace built by our own Andrew Carnegie. And as we look into the future, there is no prospect of any other court.

ONLY ONE WAY OUT

And Only One Forum

It is equally unthinkable that the World Forum, the League of Nations, can now be scrapped. The League is five years old; it has 54 adherents; it has its League Covenant; it has its organization with about 160 representatives in the Assembly, representing all the 54 nations and with 10 men in the Council, representing the big nations and several of the little ones; it has 400 employees in the Secretariat, with as many more in the Labor Office; it has a score of committees and commissions all as busy as bees; it has records, including 632 treaties dependent for their validity on the fact that they are deposited with the Secretariat. It is a great and going concern.

With these two great going concerns—the Court at the Hague and the League at Geneva—already in existence, it is as preposterous to suggest that we could, if we would, substitute something different for either of them, as it would be to suggest substituting something different for the United States of America. We can find fault

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

with our United States, more fault—if we can believe the front page of almost every daily newspaper—than we can find with the League of Nations! But if, say, California or Texas or New Mexico, when offered the chance to become a State of the United States, instead of a territory, had coolly asked us to scrap *the* United States so that they could prepare *a* United States, how would such a proposal have been received and what would have been the result?

We must continue to be on our guard against those who are trying to draw such red herrings across our trail. It is the same little band of irreconcilables who once sought to kill *the* League by offering *a* League, that recently sought to kill *the* Court by offering *a* Court, who thus try to evade, to dodge, to mislead.

The conclusion, then, is that not only *must* we have a Court and a Forum in common with the rest of the world, but that there is only *one* Court and only *one* Forum which we *can* have in common with the rest of the world. We find our practical course of action narrowed down, at the very least, to the course which Mr. Lever-

ONLY ONE WAY OUT

more has proposed, that we (1) join the Court and (2) sit in with the League.

Sitting In

Indeed, the Hughes Plan for our joining the Court involves sitting in with the League to the extent required for participation in the election of judges. The Levermore Plan involves only a little more sitting in with the League. Under that plan we would sit in for the purpose of general discussion, tho without any vote and without any obligation. The Levermore Plan adds only a very little—a harmless and hopeful little—to the Hughes Plan.

Already, despite our efforts to keep aloof, we have developed twenty-five American contacts with European post-war problems. Fifteen of these contacts were brought about by official action of our Government. In eight cases the Government officially appointed official or "unofficial" observers in the side shows of the League. In two cases (the Hydrographic Bureau and the Health Committee) we hold complete official membership. The Hughes-

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

Harding-Coolidge proposal, now endorsed by the Republican platform, is that we have representatives in the main tents, the Council and Assembly, when judges are to be elected, without having permanent representation. Finally, Mr. Levermore simply proposes that, instead of withdrawing when the election of judges is over, we remain as unofficial observers and talkers, but not voters, for other purposes as well, in short that we "sit in."

Again be it said, we can do much more than these two things, joining the Court and sitting in with the League, but we can scarcely do less.

Such small steps forward as these two, proposed by Secretary Hughes and by Mr. Levermore, are really no more than those which we have already taken "unofficially." Note the contrast between 1920 and to-day:

In 1920 the League was pronounced "dead," but last December President Coolidge said, "We hope it will be helpful."

Four years ago the State Department would not recognize the League, even to the extent of answering its communications; but to-day it is

ONLY ONE WAY OUT

the established policy to answer such communications promptly.

In 1920, when Holland turned over to the League its duties regarding the Opium convention, the United States demurred and, for a time, solemnly sent and received all its mail on the subject *via* the Dutch Government altho the correspondence was really with the Secretariat of the League in Switzerland; but to-day we make direct connections.

Four years ago the "American Group" of judges under the old Hague conferences declined an invitation to nominate a judge for the International Court of Justice; but later, at a by-election, they accepted a similar invitation (and their candidate was elected by the League).

Four years ago the Senate irreconcilables thought that they had succeeded in stopping all participation by the United States in any League activity; but to-day, thanks to Hughes and Coolidge, not only do we participate in many League activities, but the Republican platform contains a pledge to continue the "humanitarian" cooperation.

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

It is manifest destiny that we shall go on in the same direction. An irreconcilable senator exclaimed, after the Republican platform was adopted, "That means we shall get into the League within five years!"

The Isolationists Isolated

On their merits, what possible objection can there be to these two propositions, supporting Court and Forum? Well, there are eleven people in Washington to-day who are trying to prevent America doing even these two things. Why they so strenuously oppose even the Court as recommended by Hughes, by Harding, and by Coolidge, will bear investigation. Certainly it is not because public opinion objects to the Hughes-Harding-Coolidge plan. There must be something behind it all. The personal animosities and political ambitions of 1920 should be extinct to-day. The same men who alleged in 1920 that, not they, but "obstinate" Mr. Wilson stood in the way of our entering the League with reservations, now that they themselves have the opportunity to put through the program they once

ONLY ONE WAY OUT

professed to want, not only do not put it through but try to prevent it. If they sincerely favored the League with the Lodge reservations when, so they claimed, they could not get it, why do they now oppose it when they could get it? There must be a reason, or reasons, why these eleven irreconcilables are still so irreconcilable; irreconcilable not only against Wilson, but against Hughes, Harding, Coolidge, both party platforms, and the great body of the American people themselves. Whatever the reason is that these men oppose everything and everybody, we may, at any rate, rejoice that, at last, these isolationists stand isolated themselves! No longer can they pretend to be following a popular mandate—a “majority of seven million voters.” Both parties being now committed to the Court, the isolationists represent nobody but themselves, unless it be certain special interests—an “invisible Government.”

Yet, despite this isolation of the isolationists and the almost unanimous opposition of public opinion to them, so far at least as the Court is concerned, it is still a grave question whether

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

we shall be allowed to enter even the Court, for a long time to come. The irreconcilables are still in a strategic position in the Senate—and especially in the Committee on Foreign Relations—to defeat the will of the American people. Their opposition can be overcome only by a strong assertion of that will. They have already had their way against the desires of three presidents, Wilson, Harding, and Coolidge. They will continue to have their way until the American people are thoroughly aroused.

But delay is dangerous. The risk of war is always greater in the decade following a war than at any other time. While we are waiting, another world war may be upon us.

WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS

III

WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS

Introduction

It would not do to rest the pro-League and pro-Court case at this point—to be content with showing that there is no escape from joining the Court and sitting in with the League. It remains to show the positive reasons why we should do these two things—reasons which should not simply wring reluctant consent but should arouse enthusiasm; reasons which already make some of us enthusiastic enough to devote time, money, and effort to the reeducating of the American people against the insidious propaganda of the irreconcilables; reasons which, in large measure, led Justice Clarke to resign from the Supreme Court so that he could devote his time to persuading his fellow-countrymen to approve the League and Court; reasons which led Leon Bourgeois, in like manner, to resign from the French

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

Senate so that he might devote his life to helping establish the prestige of the League in France; reasons which led Lord Robert Cecil to dedicate his great abilities to the same purpose in England; reasons which led Edward Bok to offer so large a prize; reasons which led Justice Clarke, Mr. Wickersham, and many others of us to give money as well as time and effort to the League of Nations non-Partizan Association. Evidently these men pin their faith to the League of Nations and the World Court as the great bulwarks of civilization against war. Why do they have this faith? In short, what are the basic reasons why America should join and uphold the League and the Court?

There are two groups of reasons—selfish and unselfish. Let us begin with the selfish ones, the reasons of national self-interest.

The League Stopped Six Wars

First, the record of the League is good; it is reassuring—the real proof of the pudding is always in the eating. We were more or less excusable in 1919 and 1920 to have misjudged

WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS

what the League could and would do and become. But to-day we are not to be excused. The record of the League, for five years, lies, an open book, before us. The League is its own best advertisement. As already indicated, it is winning converts every day.

It has proven to be neither a superstate nor a futile rope of sand, but something practical between these extremes. There is less threat of force, either military or economic, than most people expected, but more influence of public opinion, especially the public opinion of small nations. Like all human institutions, the League proves to be in concrete reality, not exactly what at first it seemed likely to be on paper.

In four years the League has snuffed out, or headed off, six wars, any one of which might otherwise have developed into another World War. These were: Sweden versus Finland, Yugoslavia versus Albania, Germany versus Poland, Poland versus Lithuania—all over disputed territory—Bulgaria versus Roumania over a question of refugees, and Italy versus Greece over certain murders and the occupation of Corfu.

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

Jugoslavia and Albania

Two of these may be described as respectively the most successful and least successful instances of the League's efficiency as a war-fighting device.

Jugoslavia invaded Albania, thinking thereby to take the territory that lay in dispute between them. In the days before the League, such an invasion would not have been the concern of any other countries—except possibly to join in the fight if it should go too far. But in the League Covenant, it is expressly stated that it shall be "the friendly right" of any member of the League to call the attention of the League Council to any circumstance threatening World Peace. Acting under this authority, Lloyd George telegraphed the Council sitting at Geneva, calling their attention to this invasion of Albania by Jugoslavia, pointing out that it was a plain violation of Article X, and suggesting a boycott of Jugoslavia under Article XVI.

Of course, the League itself can not boycott; for the League is not a superstate. It is more

WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS

like a Rotary Club than a government. It is only, as the French call it, a "Society of Nations," and its highest power is to *advise* the sovereign nations composing the League. Lloyd George's telegram simply meant, therefore, that England *advised* the *Advisory Committee* of the League to *advise* all members of the League to boycott Yugoslavia. But no further action was necessary; that one telegram was sufficient! Yugoslavia saw that the game was up. Her exchange fell. It became impossible for her to raise the loan by which she had intended to wage war. Accordingly, she changed her tune and offered to arbitrate. So the Council arbitrated the question and the war was stopped. Remember, it was in this same region—the Balkans—that the World War started, over an incident seemingly no more important!

The Corfu Incident

In some cases the League, in stopping wars, has not functioned one hundred per cent. Yet, even in the Corfu incident, ordinarily falsely regarded as a complete failure of the League, it

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

functioned at least seventy-five per cent. Briefly, the history of the Corfu incident is as follows: After the murder of certain Italians, attributable, Italy claimed, to Greek assassins, Italy seized Corfu, a Greek island. Presumably Mussolini intended to hold Corfu permanently; at any rate, word was being passed around that Corfu formerly and properly belonged to Italy. It was, no doubt, in order that the League should not interfere with this purpose that Mussolini threatened (in a newspaper interview) to withdraw from the League should it not yield to his wishes.

But Mussolini found that he had stirred up a hornet's nest! All the small nations in the League were seething. They felt that Corfu was Belgium all over again, that Mussolini was playing the part of a new Kaiser, and that no small nations could be safe if Article X could thus be trampled upon with impunity. They made their protests vociferously in the Assembly of the League, and public opinion throughout the world was quickly mobilized against Italy.

In the League Council, all the members except Signor Salandra, representing Italy, not only

WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS

were willing to accede to the request of Greece to consider the matter, but were ready to accept the plan of settlement offered by the Spanish representative. Mussolini saw that, in the face of such world disapproval, organized through the League of Nations, his position was untenable. But, inasmuch as he had publicly said he would not allow the League to consider this matter, the only way to "save his face" seemed to be to allow some one else to decide the dispute, and this he did by suggesting the Council of Ambassadors. Technically, be it said, he was quite justified in having the Council of Ambassadors, representing organized diplomacy, consider the matter first. For the League is supposed to begin where diplomacy ends, and, in this particular case, the Council of Ambassadors had been in charge of the boundary problem from the start and the slain men were its employees.

Accordingly, Lord Robert Cecil said, "Since Italy stands in the way of a League settlement, and since Mussolini offers to allow the Council of Ambassadors to settle the question, I shall take the liberty of communicating to the Council

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

of Ambassadors in Paris, the exact facts, namely, that, except for Italy, we would consider it and would accept the Spanish plan." Accordingly the Secretariat telephoned the Council of Ambassadors a full account of the Council's discussion, including a description of the Spanish plan, and the day after receiving it the Council of Ambassadors telegraphed Mussolini their decision, which was substantially the Spanish plan! Mussolini accepted the decision, altho it did not harmonize with his original "ultimatum."

In short, the settlement finally reached—in nine days—was due to the League, altho the credit in the eyes of the public went to the Council of Ambassadors. The Council of Ambassadors acted merely as a go-between connecting the League and Mussolini, since Mussolini had refused to deal directly with the League.

The procedure used reminds me of the story of a friend who visited India recently. After going over a Hindoo temple, he desired to give some money to the Priest who had shown him about, but the Priest refused to take his money. Thereupon, the guide, who was conducting my

WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS

friend, informed him that the Priest really wanted the money but would not take it from my friend's hands because my friend was "unclean." "Give your money," said the guide, "to the Hindoo boy, and let him hand it to the Priest," and this was done. And so the Council of Ambassadors was merely the small boy who handed to Mussolini what Mussolini would not take directly from the League!

Some people criticized the League for not standing on its dignity, but the purpose of the League is to maintain peace and to follow whatever method best secures that end. The League succeeded in: (1) giving vent to Greece's protest and so preventing rash action which might have precipitated war had there been no League (moreover, instead of being dishonored for not fighting, Greece was honored for keeping her pledge not to fight); (2) changing Mussolini's mind as to holding Corfu; (3) forming the plan finally adopted; (4) getting Italy finally to join in a vote of the Council virtually withdrawing Mussolini's original contention that such matters were no concern of the League (the vote

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

read, "*Any* dispute between members of the League likely to lead to a rupture is within the sphere of action of the League"). Throughout it all no part was played by America, altho there was grave danger of another world war had not nations other than Italy and Greece taken a hand in the matter.

The League's Five Methods

The League has many methods at its disposal for preventing or stopping war, available whenever ordinary diplomacy fails. There are five principal methods: (1) getting the disputants to refer their dispute to a third party, *e.g.*, the World Court or the League Council, for judicial decision, arbitration, or conciliation; (2) a "cooling off" period while the third party is trying to arrive at a fair settlement; (3) the possibility of other attempts at adjustment if the first does not succeed; (4) recommending (not ordering) a boycott against a nation which violates its pledges; (5) recommending (not ordering) military force as a last resort against such a nation, if all other efforts fail. Thus, recom-

WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS

mending force is only the last resort; it has never yet been resorted to and probably never will be, and even if it should be, each nation would be free to reject the recommendation if it did not feel called upon to accede to it.

The League Made the Court Possible

Besides snuffing out six wars—never using force, but preventing its use in each case—the League has made possible the World Court. A World Court had been sought ever since the Hague Peace Conferences of 1899 and 1907, but for a long time proved unattainable because every nation on earth insisted on having a judge, while some wanted more than one judge. Consequently, the only practical result of the efforts of the Hague Peace Conference to create a world court was the so-called Hague Tribunal, already referred to, a “panel” of 135 judges.

Only when the League came along was it possible to sift down one or two hundred names so as to form a workable Court. The League afforded the much needed sifting machinery, the electoral college, as it were. It gave every na-

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

tion a fair *chance* for a judge—a chance to have its nominees considered and their qualifications discussed—without actually giving every nation a judge. Some two hundred nominations were put into the League hopper three years ago and sifted down to eleven. When any judge is selected both by the Assembly of the League, where every nation has a vote, and by the Council of the League, where the four great Powers, (five when the United States goes in) together with six small Nations elected by the Assembly, have votes, that judge is thereby duly elected. This method of election was the proposal of Elihu Root, and it was suggested to him by a Professor of Law in Harvard University. It surmounted a difficulty previously insurmountable.

As Justice Clarke has well said, merely by thus giving to the world, for the first time in history, an International Court of Justice, the League has justified its existence. Henceforth, disinterested justice will have a greater chance to be heard, while interested force will have less. War will give place to law—will be outlawed—in fact, as well as in name.

WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS

The League Rescued Austria

But the League has much more to its credit than stopping six wars, and setting up a Court to stop other wars. It has resuscitated Austria. Two years ago Austria was bankrupt and appealed to the League for help, thereby beginning one of the most dramatic episodes in all history. A nation once great, but now defeated and humiliated, calls for help to a League, consisting for the most part of its former enemies, and calls not in vain. For the League does not represent, as its detractors have claimed, the vengeance of the conqueror—a “means of holding Germany and Austria down”—but rather, it represents peace on earth and good-will toward men.

Of course, the League could not render any *direct* help because it is not a “superstate.” It has not the first principles of statehood. It has not the power to levy taxes for its own support. It has no army, no navy, no police. It is a forum for discussion and planning. It has no power to compel any one to accept its recommendations.

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

What the League did do was virtually to say, "If you will meet us half way, we will recommend to the members of the League that they help finance you; first, you must discharge your supernumerary employees, including a hundred thousand railway employees which you can't afford; in this and other ways you must cut your expenses to the bone. On the other hand, you must tax yourselves until it hurts. When you have thus increased your revenue and lowered your expenses, you will come nearer balancing your budget and have less need to inflate. Inflating your paper money is ruining you. If you do all that you can to stop inflation, we will advise the other members of the League to finance you out of your difficulties and put you on your feet." To administer the Austrian finances, the League appointed Mr. Zimmerman, of Holland, as a sort of receiver, and on the advice of the Council of the League, the creditor nations postponed the payment of the debts of Austria for twenty years, *i.e.*, gave her a twenty-year moratorium. In the meantime, they helped Austria to raise money by under-

WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS

writing thirty-two million pounds sterling of Austrian bonds. These bonds would never have sold at all if they had had nothing behind them except the pledges of a bankrupt Government. But, following the recommendation of the League, they were underwritten by Great Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, Sweden, Switzerland, and Czecho-Slovakia, and so underwritten they became readily salable. Within fifteen minutes after being put on the markets of the world these bonds were oversubscribed.

This resuscitation of Austria became the economic miracle of Europe. None of the underwriters has needed, or will be needed, to be called upon. To-day Austria is doing business, and her neighbors are bringing business to her, as a better market than their own. Inflation has stopped, and her paper money is now on a stable basis so that commerce is possible. All this is due to the League of Nations. The League of Nations is to-day doing the same thing for Hungary and Albania. In the case of Hungary, an American, Jeremiah Smith, is receiver. Even for Germany much the same model was followed

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

in the "Dawes Plan." The essentials of all these plans are the same—a moratorium, an external loan, and a bank of issue beyond the reach of inflation.

Why Not Germany Too?

The Dawes plan, or something like it, for Germany undoubtedly would have been, not only recommended, but actually put in force long ago had America been in the League of Nations. The reason why such a plan was not carried out for Germany, but only for Austria, was that France was willing to let a little enemy recover, but not a big one.

The Englishman virtually told the Frenchman that he ought to let Germany recover as a means of promoting Germany's power to pay reparations. But the shrewd Frenchman replied, "Ah, but if Germany recovers sufficiently to pay us she will recover sufficiently to fight us, and she will fight us instead of paying us, in fact she will fight us in order not to pay us."

If we are to understand France, the one thing we must never overlook is that what France

WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS

desires above all else is security. She wants reparations, but she wants security more. She is still a shell-shocked country, in more senses than one. She has fear of Germany on the brain, and who can blame her? If that fear could be allayed, she would be willing to allow Germany to recover in order to get reparations from her. After France felt that America had deserted her, she saw, or thought she saw, that her only real means of safety from attack by Germany lay in her own military strength. This explains the so-called militarism of France to-day. As George P. Auld, formerly with the Reparations Commission, has said, America has a big responsibility in thus throwing France back on her own resources. France really not only wanted America to join the League of Nations and accept Article X in particular, the one safeguard against invasion, but also, so to speak, a special application of Article X to safeguard against another unprovoked attack by Germany.

Had we joined the League, Article X and all, the whole history of Europe, since 1919, would probably have been different. France might

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

then have felt herself secure. She would have felt that Germany would never dare attack her. Under these circumstances, there would never be any attack; and there would be no occasion for the United States to send troops abroad. France, under these circumstances, would never have kept her army of seven hundred thousand men, would never have entered the Ruhr, and would, long before this, have allowed a sensible settlement of the reparation question so that Germany could pay to the utmost of her capacity.

But, lacking this feeling of security, France entered the Ruhr as soon as she could find a pretext in order, really, to hold Germany down; for the Ruhr is where the munitions, both mechanical and chemical, are made; and as long as France has her grip on these economic vitals of Germany, Germany can do her no harm.

We see, then, that France was, in her opinion at least, forced to such measures by our refusal to give her the cooperation she wanted. Failing to secure sufficient international guarantees, she fell back on national guarantees.

In short, the reason the League of Nations has

WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS

brought about the resuscitation of Austria, and not that of Germany, is that the League could accomplish the smaller job, but not the larger one, without America's aid.

Even now should we merely join the Court and sit in with the League, French fears would be lessened, and the recovery of Europe thereby hastened, to our own direct financial and commercial advantage.

The League's Humanitarian Work

Besides promoting peace and the economic recovery of Europe, the League has many wonderful humanitarian accomplishments to its credit. It has stopped the spread of disease from one country to another, such as typhus from Poland; it has limited the opium trade and reduced the white slave traffic. The last fact should especially be emphasized because among the false pictures of the League, freely circulated in the 1920 propaganda of the irreconcilables, was one to the effect that the League recognized white slavery. Of course, it never did, and now it is proving to be the greatest

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

agency the world has ever had for suppressing white slavery, the traffic in women and girls, throughout the world, largely under the leadership of our own Miss Grace Abbott, altho she is only an "unofficial observer."

The League Record as a Whole

The most remarkable fact about the League is that its Conference method so generally succeeds in bringing about unanimous agreement where, prior to the conference, the disagreements seemed irreconcilable. As Will Irwin so well says, after a first hand observation of the Opium Committee, where commercial interests, at one time, seemed adamant against reform, the League conferees find it "impossible, in the end, *not* to agree!" The whole passage is worth quoting as typical of League Conferences in general. "Yet to me and to others who watched those tense meetings in the Hall of Open Diplomacy the agreement on the opium question was not the real feature, the real headline to the story. The outstanding fact was that two bodies of men so widely different in background

WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS

and character, meeting under circumstances calculated to raise all possible suspicion, dislike, mutual distrust, found it impossible, in the end, not to agree. Across the invisible distances the dead eyes of forty million drugged men and women were staring, their loose lips muttering an appeal. And all these hard-headed administrators, technicians, politicians, were also in their hearts men of good-will. But they knew that no nation could accomplish this task alone. A current of history stronger than the collective human will was sweeping them together, as it is sweeping together, spite of twigs and straws, which they think are fighting the torrent, all the races and tribes of men."

Yes, the record of the League is good. Few, if any, dare assert the contrary to-day. While it may be freely admitted that the League has not always functioned one hundred per cent., that is the worst that can be said against the League. Like all human institutions, it has had its shortcomings and has not always done the ideal thing. This has been chiefly because it has lacked the necessary strength or prestige.

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

But this is clearly an argument for America's joining it and imparting that much needed strength and prestige, not for our holding aloof and sneering at the League for its weakness which we could so easily remedy.

It should be emphasized that the League has never done harm; everything it has touched has been at least bettered thereby. That, surely, is the supreme test, and we may marvel that the League has met the test so well, considering that it is still an infant of only five years, and that, in a sense, its own mother, thanks to our irreconcilables, deserted it at birth.

What the Court Has Done

The history of the Court is likewise good. It is two years old. Its eight advisory opinions and its one decision in a controversial case (the Wimbledon case) have been accepted as authoritative. It has settled more disputes in its brief career than did our Supreme Court in a similar period.

So our first reason for joining the Court and the League is that their history is good. They

WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS

deserve our support on their splendid record, made—we should blush to remember—without our help.

What say those irreconcilables to this record? Why do they hang their heads in silence?

OTHER SELFISH REASONS

IV

OTHER SELFISH REASONS

Our Own Traditions

The second selfish reason why we ought to join the League and Court is because our own traditions are favorable to such action. We need not go back to the days of George Washington, when the Atlantic Ocean was far wider than it is to-day; but back as far as President McKinley we find every President of the United States, without a single exception, in favor of America joining a World Court, while from Roosevelt's day, every President has been in favor of our joining a League, or Association, of Nations; and only the last two have even wavered.

The idea of a World Court is, in fact, peculiarly an American contribution. It was early advocated by such men as Joseph Choate, and the realization of it was finally achieved by such men as Elihu Root.

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

Theodore Roosevelt

The first great statesman to favor a League of Nations was Roosevelt. He did this in 1910 when he took the Nobel Peace Prize and selected, as the subject of his address at Christiania, a League of Nations. When the World War broke out in 1914, he returned to the subject and, in a series of four articles, syndicated in the *New York Times* and other Sunday newspapers, advocated "A League of Nations for the Peace of Righteousness" to follow the World War. He said that we would be derelict of duty if, after this war, we failed to create such an agency to prevent future world wars. After America entered that war in 1917, Roosevelt again returned to the subject and continued to advocate such a League in articles in *The Independent*, *The Outlook*, *The Metropolitan Magazine*, and his book on "America and the War."

All of his writings up to this point were on *a* League, not *the* League. Roosevelt died six weeks before the Covenant of *the* League had

OTHER SELFISH REASONS

been reduced to writing, even in its first draft. However, he did live to see the League being planned. In the January, 1919, *Metropolitan Magazine* he said in reference to *the* League, being then proposed by Mr. Wilson, "Let us enter such a League," and three days before he died, namely, on January 3, 1919, while Mr. Wilson was in Paris, and after a conference with Mr. Taft on this subject, Mr. Roosevelt dictated an editorial for the *Kansas City Star*, which was published on January 13, a few days after he died. In this, his last editorial, Roosevelt stated that he could thoroughly agree in principle with Mr. Taft, and did not doubt that the details would be worked out, to which he could agree also. Altho he never lived to see the completed League Covenant, it should be noted that it, especially Article X, is strikingly like Roosevelt's description of what such a covenant should be.

William H. Taft

Ex-President Taft favored a League of Nations as early as 1915—later than Roosevelt, but

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

earlier than Wilson. When *the* League was being planned, he offered constructive criticism which Mr. Wilson accepted, and he has ever since supported Mr. Wilson and the League, without wavering.

Woodrow Wilson

There is no need to show that Mr. Wilson was for the League. It will forever be associated with his name. "A prophet is not without honor save in his own country." It was largely because of the unwillingness of his personal enemies and political opponents to allow Mr. Wilson to achieve success which has obstructed America in this matter. One prominent politician said privately, "The League is the greatest event in history; but I hate Woodrow Wilson so that I can't very cordially support it." Contrast this spirit with that of Mr. Wilson himself after his defeat. Dean Robbins of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine tells of an interview with Mr. Wilson in 1923 in which he, the Dean, and Norman Davis gave Mr. Wilson evidence that the League was coming more into favor. "Mr.

OTHER SELFISH REASONS

Wilson expressed agreement . . . and . . . said, 'I'm not sorry I broke down.' We looked at him in surprize, and then he went on to explain that if by his personal influence he had been able to secure . . . entry into the League . . . it would have been a great personal and political triumph, 'but,' he added, 'as it is coming now, the American people are thinking their way through, and reaching their own free decision, and that is the better way for it to come.' "

Warren G. Harding

Mr. Harding, as Senator, twice voted in favor of entering the League with reservations. Afterward, as candidate for President, he supported the equivocal plank in the Republican Platform for an "Association of Nations."

His statements were usually vague. They were interpreted by many pro-League Republicans as pro-League and by many anti-League Republicans as anti-League. Careful study shows, however, that all his pronouncements are consistent with his statement to me personally on August 2, 1920, when I visited him to ascer-

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

tain his precise stand, "I want the United States to get into the League just as much as you do," but "I am opposed to the Wilson League. But it can be changed." I understood him to mean especially as to Article X. On August 28, 1920, he said, "He [the Democratic nominee] is in favor of going in [the League] *on the basis announced by the President. I am not. That is the whole difference between us. . . .* I am opposed to such a scheme [as the unamended League]. . . . The other type is a society of free nations, or an association of free nations, or a league of free nations, animated by considerations of right and justice instead of might and self-interest . . . such an association I favor with all my heart. . . . Advocates of the League of Versailles state the Hague Tribunal lacks teeth. Let's put teeth into it. . . . If, in the failed League of Versailles, there can be found machinery which the Tribunal can use . . . let it be appropriated. I would even go further. *I would take and combine all that is good and excise all that is bad from both associations . . . if the League . . . has been so intertwined . . .*

OTHER SELFISH REASONS

into the peace of Europe that its good must be preserved . . . *then it can be amended or revised.*"

September 3: "I warn you now that if you ever accept the League of Nations *as it stands written at present*, we are in honor-bound to answer the call of European nations to come to their defense."

September 5: "I have tried to make it clear that I want America to play its part in creating some new association of nations—I don't care specifically about the Hague Tribunal any more than I do about the League. . . . I would suggest an association or a society or a league. . . . I am talking about the League as an international political body on the one hand and proposing a rational substitute for it, or an *amended form* of it."

September 8: "Mr. Wickersham's statement [on September 5 that Harding was pro-League] calls for no construction by me. . . . We are all agreed now that amendment, or revision, or reconstruction is possible and vastly better than reservation."

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

October 14: "Our first duty, having rejected . . . the . . . betrayal of America as expressed, for instance, in Article X . . . is to set our faces toward an association with other nations. . . . I regard such a policy as perhaps the greatest contribution . . . for . . . the world's peace."

October 26: "[Commenting on Bourgeois' statement that Article X is inconsequential] The only safety for the United States is to *remain outside* [the League] *until* we may unite upon a plan for an association of nations that shall mean the same thing to everybody."

The above quotations speak for themselves. In the equivalent of about thirty typewritten pages concerning Harding's statements, of which the foregoing are fair samples, I can find no campaign utterance definitely and totally rejecting the League. Mr. Harding accepted the support of Mr. Taft and "the 31," including Root, Hughes, Hoover, Wickersham, Strauss, Stimson, and Lowell, who believed and proclaimed him to be pro-League and advised voters to vote for him on that basis.

But, following his election, Mr. Harding, after

OTHER SELFISH REASONS

some feeble efforts, found it impossible to muster sufficient senate support to insure his modified League program; the irreconcilables seemed to persuade him, themselves, and the country, that the overwhelming Republican victory was really an anti-League victory. After this surrender, acquiesced in by his most ardent pro-League cabinet members, Hughes and Hoover, he contented himself with proposing, as the "first step," membership in the World Court.

Nevertheless he was not fully content. In November, 1921, at the Arms Conference, according to General Allen, he tried to bring forward the promised "Association" of Nations but found it inexpedient. After he died, Walter Wellman described an interview with Harding shortly before he died in which he said he intended soon to make good the "Association" plank by calling an international conference in 1924.

The following despatch from Marion, Ohio, November 3, 1920, by Frank J. Taylor shows how a watchful newspaper, as well as Mr. Harding himself, had interpreted the campaign:

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

"After Democratic headquarters had conceded last night the election of Senator Harding to the presidency, I offered the congratulations of *The Globe* and asked the president-elect: 'Senator, *The Globe* has supported you, believing in the League of Nations. *The Globe* wants to know, now that you are elected, whether or not you intend to enter a league.' To which Senator Harding replied: 'You can assure *The Globe* that it need have no apprehension about our entry into a league or association of nations. I have covered that question thoroughly in my campaign, I hope. *The Globe* need have no worries.' "

I followed up Wellman's article by quoting Harding's explicit statement to me after which others, publicly or privately, described similar statements to them.

It seems worth while thus to summarize Harding's somewhat vague statements because, after he died, anti-League politicians vociferously claimed him as one of them and assailed those who attempted to recall the facts which have just been cited.

OTHER SELFISH REASONS

Calvin Coolidge

Mr. Coolidge, when a candidate for vice-president, and before, favored the League. After the election of 1920, in a speech to Boston business men, he said: "I doubt if any particular mandate was given at the last election on the question of the League of Nations." *The New York Times* (November 24, 1920, page 1, column 4) reported his saying "that the League brought back by President Wilson was 'dead.' Whether the people would decide to use the old League as a working basis in forming a new world body was the question, the governor said"—statements almost as equivocal as Harding's, but, like Harding's, looking forward to keeping, in good faith, the party platform pledge of an Association of Nations.

But when he became President, Mr. Coolidge, like Mr. Harding before him, found himself blocked by the irreconcilables in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Rather than fight these irreconcilables, split his party, give Hiram Johnson his one chance to run for Pres-

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

ident, and perhaps wreck his whole legislative program, he surrendered even more explicitly than his predecessor. But be it noted that Mr. Coolidge, while calling the League incident "closed," has never said that he *approved* of its being closed. It is also to be noted that the Republican platform speaks of joining the Court as a "step" toward something further!

Isolation Out of Date

So our national tradition, from McKinley and Roosevelt down, has, with some political equivocation, been continuously in favor of our joining a Court and a League, or Association, of Nations.

The older tradition of isolation went by the board when Dewey took the Philippines. To-day, after the World War, isolation would be an anachronism. America is now destined forever to have close contact with both East and West. We have become a creditor country. Our capital is overflowing into investments abroad. Our citizens obtain concessions in Russia and Turkey. The whole civilized world stretches out its hands to have us help develop its natural

OTHER SELFISH REASONS

resources—oil, metals, rubber, etc. Economically we are “entangled,” and it behooves us to safeguard against war, the trade, finance, and travel which are involved in the tangle.

The only alternative is wholly impracticable—to build a Chinese wall about us and prohibit commercial, financial, and personal intercourse with the rest of the world. As long as there is intercourse, there will be disputes, and, unless we provide adequate means of settling those disputes peacefully, they will often lead to war.

The tradition of isolation belongs only to bygone generations. The American tradition of this generation is one of cooperation.

This, then, is our second selfish reason for joining the Court and participating in the Forum.

Our Voice in the World

A third selfish reason why we ought to join the Court and League is in order to make our voice heard in world affairs. Otherwise, great world precedents will be established without our being consulted, and we may frequently be as

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

embarrassed as when the Island of Yap was disposed of by other nations against our interest and in the interest of Japan simply because we were not at the international council table to look after those interests.

To avoid such blows we should not only sit in with the League, but join it outright; for, in that case, we would have a vote, and a vote carries with it a veto power. This is true because the League requires unanimous consent for all its votes, with a few unimportant exceptions. Little Persia once blocked the other fifty and more nations in the Assembly.

Incidentally, here is a good place to note the fact that the unscrupulous irreconcilables, who fabricated the argument that Great Britain had six votes to our one, simply imposed on the ignorance of their audiences, who took it for granted that the League was run by majority vote. The argument, if we are afraid of other nations "putting something over" on us, is really reversed. They *can* put something over on us as long as we are out of the League, have already done so, and doubtless will do so in the future.

OTHER SELFISH REASONS

But, once we are in the League, they can *not*. No member nation or nations can put anything over on the rest. This is why Mussolini, who once (as a bluff) threatened to withdraw from the League, recently said that Italy could not afford to get out.

Our Stake in Europe's Trade and Debts

The fourth selfish reason for joining is in order to put Europe on her feet for *our* sake, so that she can again buy half of our cotton and a quarter of our corn and wheat, as she used to do but does not do now because she is too poor; and also in order that she may pay us some of the twelve billions of dollars she owes us.

The farmer has lost the foreign market. Why has he lost it? Because bankrupt people have no adequate purchasing power. And—to review the chain of arguments of Chapter III—why is Europe bankrupt? Chiefly because of monetary inflation. Why have European nations inflated their money? Because they can not balance their budgets by honest taxation. Why

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

can't they balance their budgets? Because of the colossal, and in some cases indeterminate, debts they owe. Why have they these colossal debts? Because France stands in the way of reducing the reparation bill, which is the key to general debt reduction. Why does France thus stand in the way? Because she is afraid to let Germany recover lest Germany attack her. Why is France afraid? Because she has not sufficient confidence in the power of the infant League and the infant Court to keep the peace. Why does she lack confidence? Largely because the League and the Court lack the prestige which only the most powerful and disinterested nation on earth could give them.

It is we ourselves, then, who stand in the way of European recovery and therefore of our own prosperity as dependent on that recovery.

Thus the fourth reason for our joining is that we ought, in our own interest, to help restore Europe so that she can again become the good customer she once was, as well as to enable her to pay such a part of the debt she owes us as may be practicable.

OTHER SELFISH REASONS

Our Interest in Competitive Armaments

The fifth selfish reason is: We ought to join to put a stop to the competition in armaments, which is ruining Europe and raising our taxes and will increasingly go on raising them. The Departments of War and Navy both tell us that if other nations are to compete in submarines, airplanes, gas apparatus, and what not, we must match their competition. We face a dilemma. Either we must compete with the rest of the world in armament or combine with the rest of the world in disarmament. The latter is the sensible course.

Already a step has been taken in the right direction through the Hughes conference for the limitation of Naval Armament; but no *one* such conference can attack more than a part of the problem. What we want is a *continuous* conference. Such is the League, and at last, after two years' study by an important committee, it has worked out a comprehensive plan of reducing armaments on land as well as on sea. Another plan has been presented to the League by

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

Professor Shotwell and other Americans. Mr. Hughes, in replying to the League's letter regarding disarmament, practically confesses that we can not cooperate because we are not a member of the League. If this be so, the fact is a strong argument for joining.

One feature of the League's plan is the virtual abolition of private traffic in munitions. In 1919, a general "Convention" on this traffic was drawn up but blocked by the United States. And now, when the League tries again to get an agreement, we again stand in the way. Perhaps the mystery of the stubbornness of some of the irreconcilables has to do with the fear of our munition makers that a vote to join the League is virtually a vote to put them out of business.

Our Interest in World Peace

The final selfish reason why we ought to join is to stop war, which is, of course, the great object of the Court and the League of Nations, and which is, thus far, the greatest accomplishment of the League.

OTHER SELFISH REASONS

It was this reason in particular which led Justice Clarke of the Supreme Court of the United States to resign his position in order to advocate the United States' joining the League of Nations. War is far more destructive to-day than it was before. With the world now shrunk into one vast neighborhood, war can no longer be localized. A war in a crowded world is like a fire in a crowded city; it must be put out instantly or it will become a conflagration. We must have a war-extinguishing apparatus, like a fire-extinguishing apparatus, and one that will work quickly and effectively. Such is the League of Nations. It took only three years for the last conflagration to spread from the Balkans to America. The next fire may spread faster and farther and be more terrible in every way. We shall always be in danger of another Lusitania incident or Sussex incident or another attempt by some future Germany to confine our commerce to "lanes" in the sea.

The situation is quite different from what it was a generation ago, or even five years ago, because of the "progress" in the art of destruc-

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

tion. With modern inventions the forces for destroying human life are so terrible that the human race must, in self-defense, prevent their ever getting loose again. Our own Professor Lewis has invented Lewisite Gas. Equipped with this gas a fleet of airplanes could, and in the next war probably would, cross the Atlantic in twenty-four hours and drop gas bombs on New York or any other American city, wiping out in a few hours a large part of the inhabitants. After a series of such bombardments these cities might become almost as dead as Pompeii, and our civilization as dead as Greece and Rome. The next war will not be confined to the trenches, but will be fought largely behind the lines, from the air, against civilians of all ages and both sexes. It will be a war between peoples, as well as between soldiers, a war upon women and children. It may be not only gas warfare but germ warfare. Perhaps a "death-ray" and Heaven knows what other and more "efficient" kinds of warfare may follow.

As Justice Clarke says, "Either civilization must destroy war or war will destroy civiliza-

OTHER SELFISH REASONS

tion." We have our choice, and we have seen that there is but one available way of destroying war, namely, through the League and the Court.

War to-day not only threatens civilization with destruction; but, what is far more serious, it threatens the human race itself.

Civilization is the product of hundreds of years, but the race is the product of millions. Shall medical experts continue to select and send to slaughter the strongest, bravest, and most intelligent young men? To do so would cut the chain of human evolution and throw man back an appreciable distance toward his ape-like forefathers. A thousand years hence the British race will lack a certain degree of strength, which it lost in 1914 through the death of the famous "first hundred thousand" of England's best stock. Had they lived, that hundred thousand would have contributed to millions of descendants in future centuries.

For nineteen centuries we have tried individualistic Christianity without a League of Nations. But in the last century Christian Europe has had forty wars ending with the World War,

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

the most terrible in all history. Why not at last try Christianity between nations as well as between individuals? That is the object of the Court and the League.

Conclusions

We have now seen six reasons of national self-interest why America should lend her support to the Court and the League.

To fix these in our memory let us enumerate them again:

First, experience with the League is favorable. Second, our own traditions are favorable. Third, we ought to have a voice in world affairs. Fourth, we ought to help make Europe once more a good customer and a paying debtor. Fifth, we ought to help stop competition in armaments. Sixth, we ought to help stop war.

REDWOOD LIBRARY
NEW YORK, N. Y.

DO REAL OBJECTIONS EXIST?

V

DO REAL OBJECTIONS EXIST?

The League Confused With the Treaty of Versailles

We have considered six selfish reasons for joining the League and Court. Are there any selfish reasons against joining? Not a single valid reason! All the alleged reasons are either excusable misunderstandings or inexcusable misrepresentations.

Some of the objections which had great weight with German-Americans and other special groups in 1919 and 1920 arose through confusing the League of Nations with the Treaty of Versailles, especially its reparation provisions. But now, whether for good or for ill, the two have been separated. We ourselves have made a separate peace with Germany so that when we do join the League it will be as a neutral nation, as

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

Holland and others did, without subscribing to the Treaty of Versailles. In fact, those who wish to revise the Treaty of Versailles ought to hasten, not retard, our joining the League; for the best chance of remedying any evils there may be in the Treaty now lies in the League. The Dawes' plan partially provides for so utilizing the League.

Again, as has already been shown, our joining the League would automatically remove, or at least reduce, the one great obstacle which has so long stood in the way of reducing the reparation bill—the French fear of a recovered Germany.

Again, the League does not “stereotype the boundaries” of European nations. It merely provides against changing them by the particular method of “external aggression,” otherwise known as “War.” It can change, and has already changed, some boundaries by juster methods.

As pointed out in Chapter III, it was thanks to the League that Germany's ally, Austria, has been put on her feet. Such a rôle of the League

DO REAL OBJECTIONS EXIST?

was foreseen at the outset. In the covering letter to Germany by which the allies transmitted the Treaty of Versailles the League was cited as the means of possible changes in the Treaty. America, not having ratified the Treaty, is in an especially strong position to secure its revision, provided we join the League. It is a ghastly joke that German-Americans have been hoodwinked into opposing the League when it offers the most practicable peaceful means of securing the one thing they most desire, a revision of the Treaty.

Would the League Take Our Soldiers Abroad?

Every judicial authority who has spoken on the subject, like Chief Justice Taft, Justice Clarke, and former Attorney-General Wickersham, agrees that the League is not a superstate, can not impair the sovereignty of its members, can not command its members, can not "order" our soldier boys abroad. Indeed, a simple reading of the League Covenant ought to have prevented any one from being taken in by such preposterous misrepresentations by the anti-

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

League propagandists, while, of course, over four years' actual experience affords no grounds for them whatsoever.

There is, to be sure, the very remote possibility of military force being used to check some future Kaiser, but the utmost the League can do is to "advise" the use of such force, not to compel its use. Each nation will have to decide for itself what it ought to do, to carry out its obligations. Moreover, according to the draft treaty for mutual protection and disarmament recently worked out by the League, the world would be "zoned" so that, in principle, only European nations would even be advised to use military force in Europe, Asiatic nations in Asia, African in Africa, and American in America.

But the main point is that the League decreases, not increases, the chances that military force will be necessary. Be it noted that when, in the World War, we did send our soldier boys abroad there was no League. In fact, it was *because* there was no League. As Lord Grey has said, had there been a League in 1914, there

DO REAL OBJECTIONS EXIST?

would have been no war. Lord Grey tried vainly to get an international conference before the nations mobilized. With the League in existence a conference could have been assembled within three days. The Kaiser would have known in advance the hopelessness of trying to do what he did. Article X would have served notice on him, that if he invaded Belgium, he would have to reckon with the whole world as a foe, just as the Monroe Doctrine served notice on him of Uncle Sam's opposition in Roosevelt's administration, in the case of his threatened invasion of Venezuela. For over a century we have never had to fire a gun in support of the Monroe Doctrine, just because Europe believed we were ready to do so.

The Monroe Doctrine

Among the most laughable of the supposed objections to the League was the claim that it interfered with the Monroe Doctrine. Both President Wilson and ex-President Taft pointed out that, on the contrary, it extended that doctrine to the whole world. Nevertheless to quiet

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

foolish fears, Mr. Wilson, at Mr. Taft's suggestion, had a special disclaimer inserted in the final draft of the League Covenant. This, as was intended, took the wind out of the sails of the faultfinders. But they then attacked Article X, quite oblivious of the humor of so doing, for Article X is the Monroe Doctrine extended to the whole world! The Monroe Doctrine is that America undertakes to respect and preserve, as against European aggression, the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Central and South American States. Article X reads, "The members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League."

Here again the League turns out to be not against American tradition, but in strict accordance therewith.

The Six British Votes

Perhaps the most potent argument against our joining the League was the "six votes" argu-

DO REAL OBJECTIONS EXIST?

ment that Great Britain has six votes to our one, and could "outvote" us. There are at least five answers to this ridiculous claim, any one of which is conclusive:

(1) Were there any real danger of being outvoted by Great Britain, no other great nation, such as France, would have put her head into such a noose. Or, if she had been so foolish, she would have taken it out again by giving the two years' notice by which any nation may withdraw from the League.

(2) The real power of the League is in the little Council of ten (or eleven if America should come in), in which the British Empire has only *one* vote.

(3) The utmost power which even the League can exercise is merely to advise, except when two disputing nations specifically and voluntarily select it as arbiter. And even its advice can not be voted except by *unanimous* consent. Therefore, no nation can "put anything over" by outvoting the others; for any member, by withholding consent, can block all the other members.

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

This third answer not only answers the so-called six votes argument, but, as noted earlier, reverses it. For if Great Britain, or any other nation, is to be suspected of putting something over, they are in a better position to do it with America out of the League with no vote at all than with America in the League with a vote.

(4) The so-called British votes of her colonies were not "put over" on us by Great Britain, but were rather put over on Great Britain by the British Colonies. Britain really feared to let her colonies have these separate votes lest political friction follow and weaken the slender ties which hold the colonies to Great Britain. This is clear if we but name the colonies: South Africa, India, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, all of which desire the utmost freedom of opinion and action and all of which, except possibly India, have full power to assert their own beliefs and to forward their own world policies.

(5) The so-called six votes argument was used to prejudice Irish-American voters against a "British-controlled" League which would "blast the hopes of Ireland" for political independence.

DO REAL OBJECTIONS EXIST?

This false argument now finds its Nemesis, not only in the fact that Ireland has attained her independence without any hindrance from the League, but also in the fact that Ireland, like the other British colonies, immediately sought to express that independence by joining the League, which she did in September, 1923! So now are we to say Great Britain has *seven* votes!!

An examination of all the alleged "arguments" against America's joining the other nations in their Society, or League, leads to the strong conviction that those "arguments" consist entirely of misunderstandings and misrepresentations. Every supposed objection has been answered by events. The five years' record of the League alone constitutes a standing contradiction of the claims that it is either a superstate or a rope of sand, that it stereotypes existing boundaries or the *status quo*, that it is an instrument for holding Germany down, that it impairs sovereignty, that it would take our soldier boys abroad, that it menaces the Monroe Doctrine, and all the rest.

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

The Real Opposition

We need not impugn the sincerity of *all* objectors to the League. Most have simply been misled. The real source of the opposition by which the objectors have been misled is, clearly, the little band of irreconcilable senators, who, for political, personal, and perhaps, in some cases, special-interest reasons, were, and still are, hostile to the League and the Court. In 1920, they played on the various prejudices of hyphenated Americans and of other partizans with great success. Now, in 1924, they are still opposing even the leaders of their own party, and are trying to defeat even the World Court proposal of Hughes, Harding, and Coolidge, on the false plea that the League has been definitely rejected by America, and that the Court is related to the League. The real motives behind the hostility of those men to any form of world cooperation by America have perhaps not yet been fully revealed—altho evidence is accumulating. Be that as it may, their “arguments,” in the light of the last five years, have not a single leg to stand on.

DO REAL OBJECTIONS EXIST?

We find, then, no substantial objections to our joining either the Court or the League, but six very substantial reasons for joining—all these six of a purely selfish nature.

OUR NATIONAL DUTY

VI

OUR NATIONAL DUTY

In the Name of Humanity

The six reasons thus far given for joining are selfish reasons—reasons of national self-interest—to save us money and to save our own skins. But there are at least two reasons of a higher kind, reasons of human and national duty.

The very fact that we are strong while Europe is weak; the very fact that we are, or think we are, safe, while Europe is in peril; the very fact that we are relatively rich while Europe is poor, imposes upon us a humanitarian responsibility. *Noblesse oblige*. The nation which virtually returned to China the Boxer indemnity, which gave its help to Cuba, which has always been the friend of the friendless and the hope of the oppressed, the nation which accepted the

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

help of Lafayette, and which laid recently the wreath on Lafayette's tomb as a symbol of its gratitude and of its own unselfish spirit in entering the World War, that nation, America, can not longer, in self-respect, abandon Europe to her fate. Considering the debt we owe the Allies for fighting the World War for *three long years* before we entered it, during which time we were making money out of the war, it ill becomes us now to abandon them as poor relations or as bankrupt concerns. We should help restore Europe, not simply for what we can get out of Europe, in trade and debt payments, but because Europe is our own flesh and blood, practically the mother country of all America. We owe our very being to her. We can not sit by and see her suffer or perish. We must no longer play the priest and the Levite and pass by on the other side. It is time for us to play the good Samaritan. We have loved to think that our flag has no selfish stripe in it—nor any yellow one—but that it symbolizes the power and the will to right wrongs. We have loved to point to our record, as in Cuba.

OUR NATIONAL DUTY

America Needed

Some objectors say, at this point, "If the League is so good why are we so necessary? Can not the other nations make the League a success without us?"

Yes, they can and have. But not in the degree which our entry would make possible. Every nation helps; the bigger, the more. Some problems, like disarmament, are scarcely soluble unless *every* important nation participates.

But the really great need of America is to add the most important, tho intangible, element of *prestige*. Both League and Court depend on public opinion. The Court has no sheriff except public opinion. America's adhesion would double its authority in the minds of men.

If any one doubts the possibilities of this subtle force—public opinion—he merely needs to look into the history of our own Supreme Court. That august tribunal has no sheriff either—as against a recalcitrant State—except public opinion. When the force of public opinion was weak, West Virginia flouted the Supreme

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

Court. So did Pennsylvania. Citizens of Massachusetts said that New York could never hale Massachusetts into the Supreme Court. Contrast that condition of public opinion with to-day's when, recently, Texas and Oklahoma accepted as a matter of course the Supreme Court's decision as to their boundary line! Our entry into the Court will greatly hasten the day when the World Court's decision will be equally a matter of course.

Our National Pride

But even if the Court and the League can work out the problem of World Peace without us, we having all the benefits but none of the responsibilities, do we want to be put in such a position? Is it not humiliating that Great America, "the land of the free and the home of the brave," after its great record of unselfishness, should now play the quitter—shirk responsibility—cower back to the home shelter lest we have to do our share in preventing war? Is it not mortifying that we alone of all the nations ask to have all the benefits and none of the

OUR NATIONAL DUTY

responsibilities of keeping the peace? We all approve, even the Republican platform, of continuing to get the benefits of the humanitarian activities of the League, yet shirk all responsibility. We even let other nations, or private individuals, pay the salaries or expenses of the American Judge on the World Court, and the many other Americans, like General Dawes, Norman Davis, Jeremiah Smith, who step into the breach which we, or the irreconcilables, have left.

What We Fought For

Finally, the most sacred reason of all is that we are in honor bound to do something to prevent war. It was on that basis that we entered the war and that our soldiers fought. Into their ears we whispered that they were fighting a war to end war, a war to make the world safe for democracy; they believed us and we believed ourselves.

What have we now to show for all of our sacrifice in money and in human life? We know why we fought the War of the Revolution. It was to get our independence; we formed the

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

United States of America. This result was worth all it cost in blood and tears. We know also why we fought the Civil War. It was to save the Union. We saved it and, at the same time, abolished the curse of slavery. These results also were worth all they cost in blood and tears. In each case we accomplished something constructive. What constructive results have we to show for the three hundred billion dollars and the twenty-five million human lives which the greatest war in all history cost? We have two things worth while to show for it, a little infant World Court, and a little baby League of Nations, neither of which has the United States yet helped to grow up.

Our boys did not fight the war merely for national selfishness, to save us money or even to save our own skins. They fought it in a high spirit of idealism. We all know the story of Sergeant York, the great war hero. When first taken to the cantonment to train, he refused even to go into bayonet practise because the Bible says, "Thou shalt not kill." His Colonel saw that there was no use putting him in the guard-

OUR NATIONAL DUTY

house, that it was not a case of cowardice, but of conscience. After two weeks of daily discussion, he convinced York that this war was to make the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," as effective between nations as it is between individuals. It was to prevent forever such invasions as that of Belgium. Its purpose was to make the world safe and to abolish war from the earth. When York grasped this idea he became one of the greatest fighters the world has ever seen. Thousands of our boys fought with like idealistic spirit, believing it was their privilege to prevent future generations of young men from ever having to go through that agony again. We should understand why the youth of to-day are taking a pledge not to fight again. The "Youth Movement" of pacifism is simply an abnormal expression of the well justified abhorrence of war. It will disappear when we do all we can to realize the dream of a warless world which we once held up before our soldiers.

The Supreme Sacrifice

I was "over there" two years ago. I visited the devastated area. I remember standing one

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN WORLD PEACE

evening, in the gloaming, in the little American cemetery at Belleau Wood, where lie our boys who first fell in the great fight, the greatest they believed in all history. It was there, if at all, we may boast, that we won the war. It was there we laid on the last straw that broke the camel's back. Our boys drove back the Germans a few miles. The Germans sought then to entrench, believing, from their experience with the French, that our boys would entrench also. Much to their surprize and dismay, instead of entrenching, our boys were upon them the second time, and again drove them back a few miles. Again they sought to entrench, but again our boys pushed them back; and again; until finally retreat became a rout. Then the Germans began to reflect: "If a few hundred thousand young, fresh, vigorous, *idealistic* American troops can fight like that, what is going to happen to us when the millions behind them come across the sea?" That took the heart out of them—that broke their morale; and we know it was the break in the German morale which won the war.

OUR NATIONAL DUTY

As I thought of those noble deeds of our soldiers, my mind turned to Lincoln's address on the battlefield of Gettysburg, and his appeal that "from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that great cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion." As I stood awe-struck in the little cemetery I wondered whether those white wooden crosses were to be our last tribute for such deeds? Do we not owe those boys something more than wooden crosses in France or stone arches at home? Do we not owe them a monument which will not only commemorate but perpetuate their work, a monument which will finish the task which they left for us to finish, the task of making this world safe for men and women and children of all races, climes, and times? Yes; we owe them a monument of human brotherhood, a monument which we once began, but which still lacks the keystone of the arch. In the words, again, of Lincoln, "Let us here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain." They kept faith with us, and we *must* keep faith with them.

HOW TO LIVE

The Nation's Foremost Health Book

NEW ENLARGED EDITION

Prepared by Professor Irving Fisher of Yale University and Eugene Lyman Fisk, M.D., under the auspices of the Hygiene Reference Board of the Life Extension Institute, which is composed of many of America's foremost citizens, including such physicians as Asst. Surgeon-General Rupert Blue; Russell H. Chittenden, Yale; Lewellys F. Barker, Johns Hopkins; Harvey W. Wiley, Pure Food Expert; R. Tait McKenzie, Director of Dept. of Physical Education, University of Pennsylvania.

The "last word" on health and hygiene. Contains vital lessons we learned during the war, and discoveries of medical science since. Endorsed by the American Medical Association, by State Boards of Health of Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, and New York, and is bought in quantities for their employees by big business concerns, including the U. S. Steel Corporation, American Rolling Mill Company, the Sherwin-Williams Company, and many others.

It Tells You How to Keep Well—

To Avoid Colds and Pneumonia
Danger of Hasty Eating
What to Eat and How
Eating to Get Fat
Eating to Get Thin
Hygiene in the Home
Outdoor Living and Sleeping
To Cure Constipation without
Drugs

Hardening of Arteries
Deep Breathing and Exercise
Acid in the Blood
Relieving Insomnia
To Treat Nervousness
Rules for Good Health
Effects of Alcohol and Tobacco
Blood Pressure

The book treats on hundreds of subjects pertaining to physical and mental health and the care of one's body, including matter concerning Marriage, Heredity, Patent Medicines, Relaxation, Fat, Sunlight, Food Values, Degeneracy, Despondency, Overweight and Underweight. Strictly non-technical; absolutely authoritative, and delightfully comprehensive. 497 pages.

12mo. Cloth. \$1.50, net; \$1.62, post-paid.

From your bookseller or the publishers

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY, Publishers
NEW YORK and LONDON

HOW TO SPEAK IN PUBLIC

A Most Suggestive and Practical Self-Instructor

By GRENVILLE KLEISER

Author of "Power and Personality in Speaking," etc.

This book is a complete elocutionary manual comprising numerous exercises for developing the speaking voice, deep breathing, pronunciation, vocal expression, and gesture; also selections for practise from masterpieces of ancient and modern eloquence. It is intended for students, teachers, business men, lawyers, clergymen, politicians, clubs, debating societies, and in fact every one interested in the art of public speaking.

OUTLINE OF CONTENTS

Mechanics of Elocution	Previous Preparation
Mental Aspects	Physical Preparation
Public Speaking	Mental Preparation
Selections for Practise	Moral Preparation
Preparation of Speech	

"It is admirable and practical instruction in the technic of speaking, and I congratulate you upon your thorough work."—*Hon. Albert J. Beveridge.*

"The work has been very carefully and well compiled from a large number of our best works on the subject of elocution. It contains many admirable suggestions for those who are interested in becoming better speakers. As a general text for use in teaching public speaking, it may be used with great success."—*John W. Wetzel, Instructor in Public Speaking, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.*

12mo, Cloth. \$1.60, net; post-paid, \$1.72

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY, Publishers
NEW YORK and LONDON

The Funk & Wagnalls

PRACTICAL STANDARD DICTIONARY

An unparalleled achievement abridged from the FUNK & WAGNALLS *New Standard Dictionary* by Frank H. Vizetelly, Litt.D., LL.D.. Outranks other Standard Dictionary abridgements as the largest abridged dictionary published. It is only semi-unabridged, for it contains in its 1,325 pages, 140,-000 vocabulary terms—about 40,000 more than its nearest competitor. Defines the very newest words and phrases in our language. (One feature is the simple treatment given to faulty diction.)

The subjects specially edited for this volume, so as to provide the latest material, are Anatomy, Biology, Botany, Chemistry, Church terms, Engineering, Entomology, Forestry, Geology, Medicine, Mineralogy, Pathology, Physics, Physiology, Psychoanalysis, Psychology, Radiography, Therapeutics, War terms.

Features at a Glance

Number of terms of all kinds in vocabulary.....	140,000
Number of proper names of all kinds.....	15,000
Number of synonymic treatments	6,000
Number of lines of synonymic treatments.....	12,000
Number of antonyms	6,000
Number of illustrations	2,500
Number of foreign phrases	1,900
Number of pages	1,325

Regular Paper Edition, with thumb-notch index.

Size 7¼ x 10¾ x 3 inches. Cloth..... \$5.00

Buckram 6.00

Bible Paper Edition, with thumb-notch index. Size

7 x 9¾ x 1½ inches. Cloth, colored edges..... \$5.00

Fabrikoid, marbled edges 6.00

Full Flexible Leather, gilt edges, boxed..... 7.50

Exquisitely bound in full crushed Levant. Size 7 x

10¾ x 1½ inches; gilt edges, hand tooled, raised bands, boxed\$17.50

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY, PUBS.
NEW YORK AND LONDON

English Synonyms, Antonyms, and Prepositions

By JAMES C. FERNALD, L.H.D., author of "Expressive English," "Connectives of English Speech," "Historic English," "A Working Grammar of the English Language," etc.

WITH this book in your possession, you need never be at a loss for the exact word you want—the *one* expression that is the most perfect mirror of your thought.

Much of the charm of literary composition, whether private correspondence or matter for publication, lies, as Dr. Fernald says, "in that exquisite precision in the choice of words which never seems to be precise, but has all the aspect of absolute freedom." While there are 15 synonyms for *beautiful*, 21 for *beginning* and 37 for *pure*, there is usually one word that expresses the shade of meaning better than others.

This book is a most thoro work of its kind and contains more than 8,000 classified and discriminated synonyms with nearly 4,000 antonyms; the correct use of prepositions is indicated by illustrative examples. The book also contains practical helps and hints on the correct use of words.

12mo, Cloth. 742 pages. \$1.90, net; \$2.00, post-paid. Exquisitely bound in full crushed Levant, gilt edges, hand tooled, raised bands, boxed, \$10.00, post-paid.

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY, Publishers
354-360 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

SEP 28 1961

APR 23 1966

New—from Cover to Cover!

An entirely reset, completely revised, immensely enlarged, and thoroughly up-to-date edition of a standard reference work—the most comprehensive and useful work of its kind in the world!

Hoyt's New Cyclopedia of Practical Quotations

By KATE LOUISE ROBERTS

who has most admirably succeeded in her effort to make this collection of quotations *the most complete and authoritative ever gathered in the covers of a book*. In importance, it occupies a position next to the dictionary.

A BOOK WITH 3,000 AUTHORS

Here are 21,000 quotations, on almost every conceivable subject—modern, old, and ancient, some dating back to the age of Homer—quotations in poetry, prose, and blank verse—extracts from the speech and literature of all nations—songs, hymns, thoughts, and famous sayings and writings of great men and women—immortal phrases from all languages, proverbs, mottoes, etc.—all arranged according to the alphabet, starting with 6 quotations under "Abhorrence" and ending with 11 quotations under "Zephyrs." Of 350 quotations under "War" many are striking expressions coined in the World War; 139 quotations are on "Man," 235 on "Woman," 334 on "Life," 444 on "Love."

This magnificent book will prove a valuable aid to every one and of special assistance and interest to—

PUBLIC SPEAKERS—To heighten the thrill of their oratory. **LAWYERS**—To clinch arguments in court. **PREACHERS**—To embellish sermons. **TEACHERS**—To drive home ideas in the words of another. **CORRESPONDENTS**—To enliven one's social letters. **AUTHORS**—To develop new view-points. **COMMERCIAL WRITERS**—To increase results. **EDITORS**—To point a moral or adorn a tale.

STOREHOUSE OF THE GREATEST THOUGHTS OF THE WORLD'S GREATEST THINKERS

With the assistance of the concordance and index in the book you can find any quotation if you know only one single word of it. You will also learn the source of the quotation, name of author, date of his birth, and death if deceased.

Hoyt's New Cyclopedia of Practical Quotations is 7 x 10 inches and contains 1,374 pages. Cloth binding, \$7.50, net; Buckram, \$8.50; three-quarter Morocco, \$12.50; full Morocco, \$15; postage, 28c. extra.

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY, Publishers
NEW YORK and LONDON

C0-BOL-333